



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,731	07/01/2003	Thomas Fey	EA1097USNA	7376

23906 7590 06/09/2005

E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER
BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128
4417 LANCASTER PIKE
WILMINGTON, DE 19805

EXAMINER

CAMERON, ERMA C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1762

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

W

Supplemental
Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/611,731

Applicant(s)

FEY ET AL.

Examiner

Erma Cameron

Art Unit

1762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-14 and 41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7, 14 and 41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-10, 12 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

The examiner made an error in paragraph 17, and is therefore resubmitting the office action. The rejection in paragraph 17 should have been under 102(b), not 103(a). The examiner apologizes for the error.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claim 41 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: claim 41 is drawn to the same invention as originally filed claim 28. Originally filed claim 28 is a nonelected species of invention (see office action of 2/15/2005).

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 41 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-10 and 12-13, drawn to a method of coating, classified in class 427, subclass 146.

II. Claim 14, drawn to an article, classified in class 427, subclass 411.1+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

3. Inventions of Group I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be made by a materially different process, such as applying a coating without using a foil.

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- a) wherein the binder has free-radically polymerizable olefinic double bonds (claim 6);
- b) wherein the binder crosslinks by condensation or addition reactions (claim 7).

Art Unit: 1762

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1762

7. During a telephone conversation with Hilmar Fricke on May 26, 2005 a provisional election was made WITH traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I and a), claims 1-6 and 8-13. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 7 and 14 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Double Patenting

9. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1762

10. Claims 1, 6 and 10 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 5 and 7-8 of copending Application No. 10/700384. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '384 claims screen printing of the coating on the backing foil, whereas '731 is silent as to the application method, and therefore, any application method, including screen printing, would be available.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12. Claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a process wherein the thermal energy cures the coating composition, does not reasonably provide enablement for supplying thermal energy without curing the coating composition. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Art Unit: 1762

Claim 1 does not explicitly state that the thermal energy cures the coating composition.

13. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

14. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a) Claim 12: it is not clear what is being sealed.

b) Claim 13: it is not clear what "which are accessible" refers to, making the claim indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

16. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-10, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by George (4061516).

Art Unit: 1762

'516 teaches applying a design, thermoplastic base coat (an acrylic) and an adhesive (another acrylic) to a carrier sheet such as Mylar, and adhering the coating material to a substrate thru heat and pressure from a roller (i.e. contact heating), after which the Mylar sheet is stripped off (1:55-3:15).

'516 does not state that the coating materials are cured before application to the substrate, therefore, they are expected to be uncured, as well as in a tacky state. The acrylic adhesive is a clear layer that would have the effect of sealing the base coat and design. The acrylics are olefinic double bonded materials that cure with free-radicals.

Regarding the substrate, the substrate of '516 may be an automotive part or fitting.

17. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by WO 95/02461.

'461 teaches applying metal particles, as well as a varnish such as polyurethane, to a transfer agent (plastic film). The transfer agent and a substrate are then brought together, before the varnish has had a chance to cure, and then the varnish is cured with heat or radiation. Then the substrate and transfer agent are separated. There would inherently be pressure when the transfer agent and substrate are brought together (pages 2-5).

Regarding the substrate, the substrate of '461 may be an automotive part or fitting.

The varnish may be applied to the substrate as well, thereby meeting claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over George (4061516).

'516 does not teach that the substrate is precoated, or that the foil is textured, but these are obvious variations in the process.

20. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 95/02461.

'461 does not teach that the foil is textured, but this is an obvious design variation in the process.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 1762

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erma Cameron whose telephone number is 571-272-1416. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ERMA CAMERON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
June 2, 2005

Erma Cameron
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762